

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,629	06/01/2001	David Ho	HODA3002/EM/6838	9000

23364 7590 08/27/2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 SLATERS LANE
FOURTH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

AVELLINO, JOSEPH E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/870,629

Applicant(s)

HO ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph E. Avellino

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) ✓
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9 are presented for examination. Claim 1 independent.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said value of each character" in line 3 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For examination purposes this will be interpreted to mean "data representing the character".
6. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said sent information" in line 3 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
7. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said non-frequently used and qualified type of said internal code" in line 9 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

8. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said received information" in line 11 of the claim.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

9. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said converted information" in line 13 of the claim.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

10. Claim 1 recites the limitation "an conversion" in line 7 of the claim. This is a grammatical error and must be corrected.

11. Claim 5 recites the limitation "said calculation result". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

12. Claim 8 recites the limitation "said length of said information" in line 4 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

13. Claim 8 recites the limitation "said non-frequently used words" in line 6 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

14. Claim 9 recites the limitation "said result of said step d". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

15. Claim 9 recites the limitation "said information" in line 1 of step g. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu (US 2002/0120654).

18. Referring to claim 1, Xu discloses a transmission system for identifying a selected type of internal code contained in information sent from a sender device, a process in said system comprising:

checking whether the character contained in the information is within a default range of a predetermined internal code (Xu discloses the use of a web browser working on the internet, which used the TCP/IP transmission protocol, which uses CRC checks to ensure the data received is correct) (p. 1, ¶ 14);

performing a conversion and an analysis on the checked information based on the internal code (i.e. check to see which format the Chinese characters are encoded in, whether it be GBK, GB2312, BIG5, etc) (p. 2, ¶ 28-31);

selecting an internal code (i.e. Unicode) compatible to a recipient device (p. 2, ¶ 28-31); and

displaying the converted information at said recipient device (Figure 3, reference character 78).

19. Referring to claim 2, Xu discloses the transmission system is implemented as an electronic device having a transmission capability (Figure 1). Xu does not specifically disclose that this transmission capability is infrared, however it is well known in the art that numerous computer devices are able to transmit using infrared to a network (i.e. PDA's, mobile phones, remote controls, laptop computers, etc.). By this rationale, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the capabilities of infrared transmission to the system of Xu to provide another medium in which to transfer information, thereby making the system more robust and compatible with other devices.

20. Referring to claims 3 and 4, Xu discloses the transmission system is implemented as an electronic device with a web browsing capability (e.g. abstract) but not necessarily a PDA or mobile phone, however, it is well known that both these mobile devices are able to run web browsers and download code to execute programs through a communications port. By this rationale, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to install the invention of Xu as a PDA

Art Unit: 2143

or mobile phone to allow portability to the user, thereby increasing customer satisfaction of the invention and providing more services to the user.

21. Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu in view of Chiang (USPN 6,154,758).

22. Referring to claim 5, Xu discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Xu does not necessarily disclose an infrared communication module for effecting a reliable information transmission. In analogous art, Chiang discloses an I/R port which inherently effects a reliable information transmission since no use would come from the I/R port if the communication was not reliable (Figure 1, ref, 28). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Chiang with Xu to allow a user to input characters and convert them without having to mediate between a third language as supported by Chiang (col. 2, lines 25-30).

23. Referring to claim 6, Xu discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 5. Xu does not specifically disclose the display module is an LCD. Chiang discloses the display module is an LCD (col. 5, lines 1-15). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Chiang with Xu to allow a user to input characters and convert them without

Art Unit: 2143

having to mediate between a third language as supported by Chiang (col. 2, lines 25-30).

24. Referring to claim 7, Xu in view of Chiang disclose the invention substantively as described in claim 5. Xu further discloses comprising a conversion table for converting said received information into one having said type of said internal code compatible to said recipient device (p. 3, ¶ 39-47). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Chiang with Xu to allow a user to input characters and convert them without having to mediate between a third language as supported by Chiang (col. 2, lines 25-30).

25. Referring to claim 8, Xu further discloses comprising an identification table storing all types of internal codes and a number of non-frequently used words (when the word is rendered, it is searched through the fonts to determine the Unicode character representation, since the characters have to be rendered, they inherently contain the words, frequently and non-frequently used) (p. 2, ¶ 24-27).

Conclusion

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

27. Kleinschmidt, P (DE 019508017A1) discloses a portable communication device with translation capability.


28. Amano, T. (JP 402135568A) discloses a character mode and font setting system for information processor.
29. Etelaperä (USPN 6,262,735) discloses utilizing the contents of a message.
30. Ma et al. (US 20020073217) discloses facilitating communication between a wireless device and disparate devices or systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph E. Avellino whose telephone number is (703) 305-7855. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (703) 308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JEA
August 12, 2004


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100